

# Dual Government

—(Continued from Page 1)—

stated in a Presidential message, and formally approved by the legislative branch, may mean nothing. It is wholly possible that we shall follow the opposite policy of appeasement of the Communists, surrender our advantage, and a sell-out of our loyal allies in Asia. Why am I so certain that the wishes of the American President, the American Congress, and the American people, may be flouted?

## TWO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY CENTERS

The reason is —briefly— that we have two lines of authority in foreign policy-making. One is the line of responsibility laid down in our Constitution. The other is a network whose members deliberately disregard our Constitution, our President, and our Congress, and act as a law unto themselves.

The sad fact is that no public document, no formal commitment, no legal mandate, can determine American foreign policy today. Our fluctuating foreign policy is a tug-of-war between these two forces. It is an unsettled question which group will be triumphant in the struggle to shape our nation's destiny.

We have seen again and again in the last two decades, that the foreign policy put forward in our public statements, is not the foreign policy carried out by our government.

This is not because the American government is a two headed monster. It is led by That would be a most inaccurate statement of what has happened.

The reason is that the American government is a two headed monster. It is led two different organizing centers. The never-settled question of which center is to determine our foreign policies has kept us in constant turmoil, and made us look futile and ineffectual before the world.

This conflict between the two heads of our government will not end until one or the other is wholly defeated, uprooted and destroyed.

For years now our government has been pulled in two opposite directions in making its decisions.

## ONE CENTER IS PRO-SOVIET

The hearings of the so-called Tydings Committee disclosed clear evidence, in spite of the whitewash, that a powerful and ruthless group were guiding our decisions to the advantage of the Soviet Union. This was not news. Committees of Congress had been making the same charge for years.

The Russell Committee, which investigated the dismissal of General MacArthur, and investigations by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, showed that a secret faction in our government had worked out its own foreign policy, to suit its own ends, and had by infinite skill, patience and ruthlessness, put it into effect, regardless of the legally established foreign policy set by Congress and our President.

Throughout all of 1951 and 1952 the Congress, especially the Senate, was engaged in a Great Debate to turn the light on this secret foreign policy and destroy its influence. You know the achievements of this secret group.

After the defeat of Japan in World War 2, our foreign policy was to defend and strengthen the Nationalist government of China. But the secret faction in our government was determined we should support the Chinese Reds. In the name of the United States government, they insisted on a "united front" government in China, with the Communist rebels retaining their own armed forces. Our representative gave the Reds a long cease-fire by which they could rest and re-equip their armies, and he set up an embargo on American bullets for the guns of the defenders.

Since 1950, we have had two policies for the Nationalist government on Formosa. Our official policy was to support the legal government and help rearm the Nationalist forces. Congress voted the money again and again as proper for our own defense. But

the hidden faction in our government intended that we should disengage ourselves — as the polite phrase goes — from the Nationalists. Their real policy for Formosa paralleled the famous advice of Mr. Lattimore, to let Korea fall but not let it look as if we pushed her. In December, 1949—five years ago—our State Department even issued instructions to its personnel abroad to show no regrets when the government on Formosa fell—according to plan. During the war in Korea, we were ostensibly fighting to defeat the Red Chinese attackers. Our military leaders, our people, and I believe most of the members of the administration, were loyal to that objective. But the invisible group had a different policy. They were determined to prevent military victory over the Reds. They intended to return by force the Chinese prisoners of war who did not wish to go back to Communist China, as they returned the hopeless refugees in Europe after 1945. They intended to leave North Korea a wasteland, occupied by Red troops who could infiltrate South Korea at will and descend at a moments notice on Free Korea, with armies rested and re-equipped.

The secret group won every objective except the return of the pitiful prisoners of war, who were saved by the insistence of Congress and the unremitting determination of our military leaders. The same double



purpose can be found in our German policy, in Austria, in Italy, in Greece, and in the tragic surrender of all Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union.

The public policy of the United States, which has in almost all instances denounced conquest and supported the independent nations, has faded away. The secret policy of the faction so friendly to the Soviet Union has in almost every instance been triumphant.

Our public policy of resisting Communism has succeeded only in Turkey, and to a limited extent in Greece. But Secretary of Defense Forrestal, who was determined to block the Communist advance, and who won over President Truman, was driven to an early grave. His hard policy of armed resistance to Communism was replaced by the soft policy of economic aid to Europe. From 1945 to 1952 the power of the Soviet Union spread east and west, until it covered one third of the world and put millions of people in bondage.

The conflict between freedom and slavery was not lost in Asia or Europe. It was lost in Washington, because the little group in our policy-making which favored the Soviet Union was stronger than the people who believed in a pro-American policy.

## ITS PROGRAM IS DEFEAT OF THE FORMOSA POLICY

I say to you that the Eisenhower policy, for defense of the perimeter of the free world where it is threatened in the Formosa Straits, will be undermined, eroded, covered up, twisted and made over into, a policy favoring Red China, unless we learn our lesson, and deal with the realities of politics

today. Already erosion is apparent. We constantly hear it dinned in our ears that it is all right for us to defend Formosa, but very wrong to defend Quemoy and Matsu. That is as if the UN should say to the United States, "You will reduce tension with the Soviet Union if you give up Alaska, which is nearer the Soviet border than it is to the United States. The Soviet Union says Alaska belongs to it. It does not matter if you need Alaska for radar information, weather information, and early warning of threatened attack. You must give up Alaska to the Soviet rulers so their tension will be lowered." Another form of erosion is hidden in the warnings that Formosa really belongs to Japan, and so it is all right for the U.S. to intervene, but Quemoy and the Tachens belong to China, and therefore, if we defend the coastal islands, we are threatening Red China. That argument omits the minor fact that we are not threatening the Reds. They are threatening us. They can not get the coastal islands except by conquest. They have already tried and failed. It is they who talk of new conquests, not we.

A third form of erosion is the attempt to get a cease-fire in the United Nations. A cease-fire would tell the Nationalists they could never win back their own country. That would be like telling George Washington he could have a cease-fire if he would remain in Valley Forge, but make no effort to reconquer New York or Philadelphia or Yorktown. A cease-fire would free the Red armies for a new attack on Indo-China. A cease-fire would give further recognition to the Red Chinese. It would tell the desperate people on the Mainland they had no hope. It would tell the people of Poland, the Balkans and East Germany, that the United States had no interest in their fate. Other pitfalls are the proposals to establish two Chinas, and sooner or later to put free China under a UN trusteeship. We know where that will lead. After Red China is safely installed in UN as a "peace-loving" nation, it will bring up the demand that Formosa be surrendered to it, and cite the Cairo Declaration as proof we have already agreed to the proposal. Perhaps the most serious threat of all is the recent report that our government intends to ask other members of the UN to help us patrol the Formosa Strait. That would end all pretense of either a pro-American or an anti-Communist policy. It would mean another "victory" like Korea.

## THE UNITED NATIONS MAKES NO COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

Whatever you make of UN in general, it should be possible to get agreement among all good Americans on a few facts. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations. So are her satellites. She has a permanent seat on the Security Council, with the veto power. The UN has no commitments to support freedom. For every obligation to the free nations it has corresponding obligations to the Communist nations. Its staff includes a proportion of open Communists, but it also has a substantial number of secret Communists. The UN recently awarded large damages to some American Fifth Amendment Communists on its staff, who were dismissed only because of hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The UN is in the middle, see-sawing between the free world and the Red world. The most favorable policy to us which the UN can adopt is neutralism. It is nearer to down-right co-existence. This is the minimum of undisputed fact about UN on which all Americans can agree. The UN is an agent of both Communists, anti-Communist and neutral nations. It has no justification for favoring the side of the free. It has never pretended to do so. Nowhere in the vast outpouring of documents that flows from the UN is there any commitment to freedom. The UN works for "peace" for welfare, for One World. It does not pretend to work for liberty.

## PRO-COMMUNISTS CAN NOT BE STOPPED BY PAPERS

Why do I say these proposals to soften up